UNITED
NATIONS

A

General Assembly

Distr.
GENERAL

A/AC.109/PV.1363
16 August 1990

ENGLISH

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 1363rd MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 1 August 1990, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. TADESSE (Ethiopia)

CONTENTS

Statement by the Chairman

Requests for hearing

Thirtieth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples

Questions of the United States Virgin Islands and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands: hearings of petitioners

/...

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages, preferably in the same language as the text to which they refer. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also, if possible, incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent, within one week of the date of this document, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Any corrections to the record of this meeting and of other meetings will be issued in a corrigendum.

90-60844 8361V (E)

best copy available

CONTENTS (continued)

Requests for hearing

Question of Anguilla: Report of the Sub-Committee on Small Territories

Question of Bermuda: Report of the Sub-Committee on Small Territories

Question of the British Virgin Islands: Report of the Sub-Committee on Small Territories

Question of the Cayman Islands: Report of the Sub-Committee on Small Territories

Question of Montserrat: Report of the Sub-Committee on Small Territories

Question of Pitcairn: Report of the Sub-Committee on Small Territories

Question of St. Helena: Report of the Sub-Committee on Small Territories

Question of the Turks and Caicos Islands: Report of the Sub-Committee on Small Territories

Question of Tokelau: Report of the Sub-Committee on Small Territories

Question of American Samoa: Report of the Sub-Committee on Small Territories

Question of Guam: Report of the Sub-Committee on Small Territories

Question of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands: Report of the Sub-Committee on Small Territories

Question of the United States Virgin Islands: Report of the Sub-Committee on Small Territories

The meeting was called to order at 10.55 a.m.

STATEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN: I wish first to welcome everyone back to the Committee, at its August session.

Before we take up the items on the agenda for this meeting, I should like to thank the members of the two Sub-Committees for successfully carrying out their very heavy workload during our first session this year. We shall examine their reports within the next few days.

I wish also to thank those representatives who, despite their busy schedules elsewhere, so ably represented the Committee at a number of meetings of intergovernmental and non-governmental bodies.

For my part, I represented the Committee in March at Namibia's independence ceremony and in July at the latest session of the Council of Ministers and Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), held at Addis Ababa, where I made a statement on behalf of the Committee expressing its support for and solidarity with the OAU's endeavours. The statement was well received and is reflected in the report of that session.

Ambassador Ahmed Ghezal of Tunisia participated in the deliberations of the Economic and Social Council in Geneva in July on the item relating to the implementation of the Declaration by the specialized agencies. Ambassador Ghezal will present an oral report on his participation when the Committee takes up the item later this week.

REQUESTS FOR HEARING

The CHAIRMAN: I wish to draw members' attention to a number of requests for hearing which have been circulated in aide-memoires 18/90 to 24/90, relating respectively to East Timor, New Caledonia, Western Sahara, the Falkland Islands (Malvinas), the United States Virgin Islands, the Trust Territory of the Pacific

(The Chairman)

Islands, and the implementation of the Declaration by specialized agéncies. Since some of the petitioners concerned will need to be informed as soon as possible of the Committee's action on their requests, I suggest that the Committee act on them expeditiously.

The first group of 21 petitioners, referred to in aide-memoire 18/90, pertains to East Timor. Members have before them in this regard a communication (A/AC.109/1045) dated 31 July 1990 from Indonesia.

I now call on the representative of Indonesia.

Mr. SRIWIDJAJA (Indonesia): The delegation of Indonesia would like to voice its opposition to the appearance of the persons listed in aide-memoire 18/90 of the Special Committee, dated 27 July 1990, as petitioners to speak about the so-called question of East Timor.

READEX FICHE

(Mr. Sriwidjaja, Indonesia)

Indonesia's position of principle in that regard is based on the incontrovertible fact that the process of decolonization in East Timor was carried out 14 years ago in accordance with General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV) and 1541 (XV), when the overwhelming majority of the people of East Timor chose independence through integration with the Republic of Indonesia.

Since then, East Timor, as the twenty-seventh province of Indonesia, has been endowed with the same constitutional rights and obligations as the other provinces of our country. Any other statements made by the petitioners on the so-called question of East Timor will be regarded as intentional interference in the domestic affairs and jurisdictions of Indonesia. Moreover, granting any persons the privilege to appear before the Committee as petitioners to speak on East Timor would serve no useful purpose whatsoever.

Consequently, my delegation strongly opposes the participation of the aforementioned persons as petitioners in the Committee's deliberations and requests that its opposition be reflected in the official record of this meeting.

The CHAIRMAN: The reservations expressed by the representative of Indonesia will be reflected in the record of the meeting. On that understanding, and if there are no further comments, may I take it that the Committee agrees to accede to the requests?

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall next take up the requests for hearing relating to New Caledonia, contained in aide-memoire 19/90.

If there is no objection, may I take it that the Committee agrees to accede to those requests?

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall next take up the request for hearing relating to Western Sahara, contained in aide-memoire 20/90.

If there is no objection, may I take it that the Committee agrees to accede to that request?

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall next take up the request for hearing relating to the Falkland Islands (Malvinas), contained in aide-memoire 21/90.

If there is objection, may I take it that the Committee agrees to accede to that requests?

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall next take up the request for hearing relating to the United States Virgin Islands, contained in aide-memoire 22/90.

If there is no objection, may I take it that the Committee agrees to accede to that request?

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall next take up the request for hearing relating to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, contained in aide-memoire 23/90.

Mr. BERGH JOHANSEN (Norway): As a point of clarification, I wish to state that a granting of the request for hearing of a petitioner concerning the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands shall not be interpreted as an acceptance on our part of the view that the Special Committee or the General Assembly is entitled to assume any functions with regard to that Territory.

We hold that position on the basis of Article 83 of the Charter of the United Nations, which stipulates that all functions of the United Nations relating to strategic areas shall be exercised by the Security Council with the assistance of the Trusteeship Council.

The CHAIRMAN: If there are no other comments, may I take it that the Committee agrees to accede to the request?

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall next take up the request for hearing relating to the implementation of the Declaration by the specialized agencies, contained in aide-memoire 24/90.

If there is no objection, may I take it that the Committee agrees to accede to the request?

It was so decided.

THIRTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES

The CHAIRMAN: Before we begin consideration of the substantive items on our agenda, I should like to share some thoughts with the Committee regarding its work.

Indeed, it is time to take stock. In 1945, at the inception of our Organization, some 800 million people - over one fourth of the world's population - lived under colonial rule. In 1990, after the independence of Namibia, there are less than 1.5 million people inhabiting the Non-Self-Governing Territories within the mandate of the Special Committee, and I may add that this is in a world with a population twice as large as in 1945.

During the last 30 years, decolonization acquired a momentum, an irresistible force that changed the international scene, not in the gradual, systematic and orderly manner thought appropriate by the administering Powers in 1945 but in a way that has catapulted tremendous changes into the world. However, there is still a great deal to be accomplished before it can be said that the decolonization process has been completed.

(The Chairman)

At this point in time, it has indeed become incumbent upon us to make a reckoning of the tasks ahead. Although most of the remaining Non-Self-Governing Territories are small in size and population, with limited resources, we reaffirm that the principles of the Declaration remain fully applicable to them. It is also incumbent upon us to remain cognizant of the specific conditions and special needs of the smaller Territories, which are unique and differ greatly. The Committee should therefore reiterate its full commitment to the principles of the Declaration, while remaining aware that a great deal of realism, flexibility and creativity will be necessary in its consideration of conditions in the remaining Territories.

As the Committee undertakes its consideration of reports and examines the political, economic and social conditions in the remaining Territories, it will no doubt attach the utmost importance to the views expressed by the peoples concerned - the peoples of the remaining Territories - and will formulate concrete suggestions that may assist in bringing about appropriate solutions to their specific problems.

This year, the Committee has the advantage not only of the working papers and reports prepared by the Secretariat, information provided by the administering Powers under Article 73 e of the Charter, but also of the reports of the seminars organized by the Special Committee in Vanuatu and Barbados. The views expressed at those two important meetings will, I am sure, be of value to all members. Beyond the reaffirmation of the principles enshrined in the Charter and the Declaration, the seminar participants have made constructive suggestions and various proposals that will assist the Committee's course of action in considering the problems of the various Non-Self-Governing Territories.

In addition to the views of the representatives of the Non-Self-Governing Territories, which the Committee was able to hear at first hand, the two seminars

(The Chairman)

also provided the opportunity to listen to representatives of regional and non-governmental organizations. The Committee will be considering in depth the two reports of those important meetings. However, I should like to highlight some of the views and urgent concerns expressed by the participants at the two seminars.

(The Chairman)

As members of the Committee will note from the reports on the seminars that will be issued tomorrow, the representatives of the Non-Self-Governing Territories have all expressed their wish fully to exercise their right to self-determination and independence according to the Declaration.

In this regard, while many called on the Special Committee to monitor events carefully in their Territories to ensure the application of the Declaration on Decolonization as speedily as possible, they indicated the specific situations in each Non-Self-Governing Territory which call for the careful consideration of the various options available to them on the basis of the concrete problems related to their political experience and economic development.

Many representatives criticized the scarcity of information on future political status available to the general population of the Non-Self-Governing Territories. Others believed that even when they were aware of the political options open to them, the lack of economic infrastructure and educational training was a serious impediment to a free decision on future political status and called for increased political support, as well as economic and financial assistance, particularly from the administering Powers.

Whatever ultimate option or choice the people of each of the remaining 18 Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories intend to make, there are at this stage several areas of concern in which the Special Committee and the United Nations system as a whole can be of assistance to them.

First and foremost, increased awareness of, and a more expanded and frequent participation of representatives from the Territories in, the work of the Committee is generally recommended and welcomed.

(The Chairman)

Furthermore, in order to break the isolation felt by the peoples in several of the Territories concerned, the Committee could request the specialized agencies to ensure better access for Non-Self-Governing Territories to the information and assistance provided by those agencies within their respective spheres of expertise. In this regard, the Committee could seek the co-operation of the administering Powers in facilitating and encouraging the participation of representatives of Non-Self-Governing Territories in regional and international organizations.

The Committee should continue to be vigorous in bringing to the attention of the administering Powers the concerns of the peoples of several of these Territories regarding the plundering of their natural resources, in particular marine resources, and ensure compliance with resolution III (a) of Annex I of the Final Act of the Third Conference on the Law of the Sea, which states that:

> "In the case of a territory whose people have not attained full independence or other self-governing status recognized by the United Nations, or a territory under colonial domination, provisions concerning rights and interests under the Convention shall be implemented for the benefit of the people of the territory with a view to promoting their well-being and development."

The Committee could similarly urge the administering Powers to preserve and protect the environment and ecology of Territories under their control and ensure that they are included in the programmes and projects of the United Nations system, such as those planned under the International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction and those designed to assist island developing countries.

The Committee should once again bring to the attention of the administering Powers the strongly felt concerns of the populations of some of the Territories at the use of their land for military installations and activities.

(The Chairman)

At both the Vanuatu and the Barbados seminars, a number of representatives of Non-Self-Governing Territories expressed their wish to receive a United Nations visiting mission in their respective Territories and called upon the Special Committee to make the necessary arrangements for such visits as soon as possible. In this connection, the Committee may wish once again to urge the administering Powers concerned to allow the Committee to meet those requests.

While stating clearly that they would not allow any foreign economic interest to prevent them from exercising their right to self-determination and independence when they deem it fit, many representatives called for increased foreign economic assistance to and investment in their respective countries as a means of accelerating their development, thereby enabling them to choose their future status.

Needless to say, the implementation of these recommendations will require the full co-operation of the administering Powers concerned. We are appreciative of the understanding and flexibility demonstrated by them during the preparation of the seminars. We particularly look forward to their continued co-operation in the future.

Their renewed co-operation, based on mutual confidence for the benefit of the peoples of the Territories under their respective administration, will be essential in our effort to meet the target of complete decolonization by the year 2000 set by the General Assembly in its resolution 43/47.

I wish at this point to take the opportunity to thank those administering Powers that participated in the Vanuatu seminar, where their contribution was most valuable.

Our thanks also go to the representatives of the Non-Self-Governing Territories, elected representatives, Chief Ministers, Ministers and other political leaders, who, through the first-hand information they provided to the seminar, contributed greatly to the success of the deliberations.

(The Chairman)

This is also the occasion to reiterate our gratitude to the representatives of regional and non-governmental organizations, our special guests, eminent personalities and experts who travelled from all over the world to share their views with the Committee on the important issues at stake.

I wish also to thank all the members of the Secretariat who worked days and nights to assist us.

Last but not least, may I, on behalf of the Committee, renew our profound gratitude to the Governments of the host countries: the Governments of Vanuatu and Barbados, which, by extending their warm hospitality and facilities to us, made the seminars possible. Owing to their unstinting co-operation and unfailing assistance, we were able to conduct our deliberations in the most pleasant and effective conditions.

The Committee will continue consideration of the item at its next meeting.

QUESTIONS OF THE UNITED STATES VIRGIN ISLANDS AND THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS: HEARING OF PETITIONERS

REQUESTS FOR HEARING

The CHAIRMAN: In this connection, I wish to draw members attention to aide-memoires 22/90 and 23/90 of 30 July 1990, containing requests for hearing relating respectively to the United States Virgin Islands and to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, which the Committee has just decided to grant. I understand that the two petitioners are present today and ready to make their statements.

If I hear no objection, I intend to invite them to make their statements at this stage.

It was so decided.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mrs. Judith L. Bourne (Save Long Bay Coalition) took a place at the petitioners' table.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on Mrs. Bourne.

Mrs. BOURNE: On behalf of the Save Long Bay Coalition and of the people of the Virgin Islands, I thank the Special Committee for the opportunity once again of presenting current information to update it on its very important task of reviewing the situation in the Non-Self-Governing Territory of the United States Virgin Islands. In this regard, may I also offer my best wishes to you, Mr. Chairman, on your continuing able conduct of the work of this Committee.

Copies of this presentation are also available from the conference officer.

(Mrs. Bourne)

The Save Long Bay Coalition of St. Thomas, the United States Virgin Islands, an association of civic groups, was formed more than three years ago to oppose more effectively the claims of the Danish-owned West Indian Co. Ltd. - known as WICO - in the main harbour of Charlotte Amalie, the capital of the United States Virgin Islands. WICO claimed that two letters from the former colonial Power in 1912 and 1913 gave it ownership of submerged land in certain portions of that harbour, the right to dredge and fill those lands, and the right to develop the resulting filled land without regard to the normal and usual regulatory statutes of the Territory.

While the United States, in the 1917 Convention of Cession with Denmark, referred to those letters by agreeing to "maintain the concession ... in accordance with the terms on which [it was] given", the identification of those "terms" has always been in dispute. Further, this claim is in derogation of both United States law and accepted customary international law, which holds that title to all submerged lands is held by the pertinent Governments in trust for the people.

Despite the continuous and vocal opposition of the population and of the elected Legislature of the Virgin Islands, WICO obtained confirmation of its claim from the courts of the administering Power, which refused to acknowledge the special status of the Virgin Islands as a Non-Self-Governing Territory to which the administering Power has special responsibilities. Rather, the courts applied to the Government of the Virgin Islands standards which were developed in connection with the constituent parts of the administering Power, while the Supreme Court of the United States refused to hear the appeal of the Government precisely because the Virgin Islands is not such a constituent part of the administering Power.

The lawsuit I have referred to was brought by WICO against the Government of the Virgin Islands, which had passed a law repealing all prior acts that had

(Mrs. Bourne)

recognized WICO's claims. When the then Governor refused to appear in defense of the lawsuit, the Save Long Bay Coalition did so in his place, representing the rights of the people of the Territory.

During the pendency of this lawsuit, the lead attorney for the Coalition's legal team was elected Governor of the United States Virgin Islands. In October of 1988, this Governor, Alexander A. Farrelly, wrote to the Secretary of State of the administering Power requesting the assistance of the United States Government in this controversy.

The Governor cited article 11 of the 1917 Convention of Cession between Denmark and the United States, which provides for resolution by negotiation or arbitration of differences such as the one which underlies this dispute. He noted further that article 11 rendered void certain sequential settlement agreements between WICO and the Government of the Virgin Islands. The lawsuit which WICO began challenged the repeal of these purported settlements.

Stating that "this is a matter of grave importance to the Government of the Virgin Islands and of some urgency", Governor Farrelly requested the administering Power to affirm that the "controversy involved the interpretation and application of an international agreement which, by its terms, requires that such a dispute be resolved by specified non-judicial means" and to take action within the terms of the Treaty to resolve the issue.

There has been no direct response to the Governor's letter, although a November 1988 letter to the Secretary of State by the Virgin Islands delegate sitting in the United States Congress did elicit a reply. That reply, which takes a strictly "hands-off" attitude, completely ignores the reports of this Committee and is incompatible with General Assembly resolution 43/44.

(Mrs. Bourne)

More specifically, that response accepts the action of the courts as final and suggests that the Virgin Islands should be satisfied with the little regulatory power it still retains over the area or that it should purchase the property from WICO at market value.

The representation of the administering Power, contained in the report of the Sub-Committee on Small Territories, that the land is subject to the regulatory powers of the Territorial Government is very much mistaken. In verifying WICO's claims, the United States courts confirmed that the filled land would not be subject to most zoning regulations, since WICO was given special zoning provisions which cannot be changed. The land is also specifically exempted from most of the provisions of the Coastal Zone Management Act, which stringently regulates all other coastal land.

The manner of construction of docks, wharves or piers is completely within the discretion of WICO; unlike the situation with regard to other developers, the Government cannot regulate the number, placement or characteristics of bulkheads, retaining walls, rock fill or "similar structures" so long as they meet "minimum sound engineering practices".

Further, the Territorial Government is obligated to support WICO's application for certain necessary federal permits, without imposing any requirements of its own, even while the federal agency which issues those permits, the Army Corps of Engineers, takes the position that it will issue the permit without modification so long as the Territorial Government supports the application.

Most telling of all, WICO will be the owner of the land, and cannot even be charged for the fill that it will dredge from the floor of the harbour and use to create its new land. All other occupiers of filled land, including those granted permission to create it by dredging and those agencies of the Territorial

(Mrs. Bourne)

Government which acquire such land, have only a 20-year lease and must pay for the sand which is dredged from the sea-bed to create the filled land.

Thus, rather than having significant regulatory power over this land, the Territorial Government must actually assist the company in carrying out development in which the Government has virtually no say.

As the Territory has no further recourse within the judicial system of the administering Power, it seems that the use of the power of eminent domain to purchase the claimed land may well be the Territory's final and only resort. However, the major impediment which I mentioned last year, the unavailability of financial resources, has increased enormously since 17-18 September 1989.

The ravages of Hurricane Hugo, which despoiled the Virgin Islands on those days, created needs which the Government of the Territory does not begin to have the resources to fill. A year ago, before the destruction by that storm, Governor Farrelly responded to a news reporter's question about the possibiliy of the purchase of the land by agreeing that acquisition is "an excellent idea" but noting that the Government was not in a position to undertake such a project. "I cannot responsibly promise to exercise eminent domain when the Territory does not at this time have the resources to purchase the property", he said. "While my views on the issue are well known, and I have written to the State Department asking that they intervene on behalf of the people, I cannot, after considering all the present needs of our people, make that a priority." Since then, the situation has only gotten worse.

The widespread destruction wrought by Hurricane Hugo has created a need for hundreds of millions of dollars of public funds for relief, rebuilding and recovery. These funds, which are being sought from various established sources, are needed to replace basic services and structures demolished by the hurricane; this effort must have priority.

(Mrs. Bourne)

Indeed, the failure of two insurance companies, leaving hundreds of residents without the means to repair or replace their damaged or destroyed property, the significant downturn in governmental revenues as a result of the dislocations caused by the storm and the enormous increase in necessary governmental expenditure from the same cause have created a fiscal calamity. Despite vigorous efforts reported in the media, the Territorial Government has thus far been unsuccessful in finding funding sources to deal with those needs.

Hurricane Hugo's devastation did not spare the Long Bay landfill. The drainage system constructed by WICO did not withstand the wind and water, and great slabs of concrete and sections of massive concrete conduits lay at odd angles over the filled area. The value of the tract was lowered, and it will remain lower until reconstruction is accomplished and the area's future vulnerability is determined.

WICO, the company which claims the right to develop those 15 acres of land in the Charlotte Amalie harbour, substantially without regulation, is ultimately owned by the East Asiatic Co. of Denmark, which is itself owned entirely by Danish nationals, most of whom belong to the royal family of Denmark. It is this foreign economic interest that has placed itself in opposition to the interests of the people of the Virgin Islands, and it is the claim of this foreign economic interest that has been upheld by the courts of the administering Power, in violation of paragraph 7 of General Assembly resolution 43/44, in which the Assembly

> "Urges the administering Power, in co-operation with the territorial Government, to take effective measures to safeguard and guarantee the inalienable right of the people of the United States Virgin Islands to own and dispose of the natural resources of the Territory, including marine resources, and to establish and maintain control over the future development of those resources".

(Mrs. Bourne)

As noted by Governor Farrelly in his unanswered letter to the Secretary of State, this matter is one of grave importance to the Virgin Islands, both to its Government and to its people. We note that the Committee on Natural Resources of the United Nations Economic and Social Council includes on its agenda the question of permanent sovereignty over natural resources, one of the issues raised by this situation.

The shoreline of St. Thomas constitutes a major natural resource and is the basis for much economic activity. The Charlotte Amalie harbour has been recognized as one of the best natural harbours in the entire Caribbean area and one of the most beautiful. Until this dredging, its role as the heart and soul of St. Thomas had continued both as a commercial port and as a rich aquatic environment which served as a hatchery for crabs, lobsters and fish. WICO's dredge-and-fill operation has already destroyed several acres of seagrass, thereby reducing the hatchery area, and encroached on the sea lane around a major marina. The increased sedimentation, pollution and other disturbances, which will be an inevitable feature of additional dredging and of development of the landfill, would have major negative effects on the remaining natural environment of the harbour.

The fisheries of St. Thomas have been recognized as being in such danger of depletion that significant restrictions have been placed on the size of certain fish and crustaceans which can be taken and on the seasons during which they can be taken. Further destruction of the hatchery environment could have even more serious economic consequences.

The beach now destroyed by fill provided local residents with access to the bay and was the only beachfront within walking distance of the town. Fishermen launched their boats, and sold their catch, from that beach.

(Mrs. Bourne)

Inland from the landfill, separated only by a road, is a public housing community of two-storey buildings. The apartments in this community are in the process of being sold to the low-income residents. Development of the landfill will wall that community off from the sea, as WICO's special zoning rights allow its buildings to be three storeys high.

The area surrounding Long Bay contains three public housing communities, a senior citizens' home, hundreds of family dwellings, four public schools, five shopping centres, the island's only hospital, a major hotel and marina and some of the most congested traffic patterns on St. Thomas. In May 1989 a local newspaper reported that the Government was negotiating with WICO to obtain sufficient land on which to build an additional lane to accommodate existing traffic. The following day, the editorial in The Virgin Islands Daily News concentrated on the current traffic problems in the area, which will be compounded with the completion of several developments being built on the road which feeds into the Nelson Mandela Circle at Long Bay, and stated:

> "Added to that are the recently announced plans by the West Indian Co. to build a 500-foot extension to its pier. That will enable WICO to accommodate one more cruise ship, which means more vehicles and more people. In addition, when WICO decides to develop the 7.5 acres it filled in along the Long Bay Road, there will be additional burdens on the area."

The dock extension, which is currently being built, utilizes a portion of the submerged land involved in this dispute. During the public hearings held last summer on that proposal WICO indicated that it also planned to use a portion of the yet-to-be-filled half of its claim for condominium developments and marinas.

(Mrs. Bourne)

With such a course of action and the covering of 40 per cent of the seven and a half acres of already filled land with commercial development, as allowed under the court's ruling, WICO, or whomever WICO may decide to sell to, will completely overload the already stressed infrastructure of that area. The likely short-term outcome will be the deterioration of the surrounding residential communities, until they are also acquired for commercial development, and the driving of the local population into less desirable and less convenient areas.

For the past several years WICO has been divesting itself of direct shipping, chandlery and cargo interests and has remodelled its warehouses into rental units for tourist-oriented retail stores. All the indications are that the land involved in this controversy will be utilized for the same purposes, even though the initial concession was granted to assist in the chandlery activities and the development of shipping in the harbour. The extension of the WICO dock will channel revenue from the Government-owned cruise-ship docks at Crown Bay to WICO, as the company is also the agent for virtually all of the cruise-ship lines which come to St. Thomas. Even now, the Government-owned docks are grossly underutilized. The development of the land at issue could create, adjacent to the WICO docks, the largest tourist-oriented shopping area in the Territory, which would devastate the taxi industry, the only aspect of tourism in the Territory controlled by local people. It would also threaten the viability of the in-town business district, the internationally known Main Street, St. Thomas.

A long-term effect of WICO's claim is the acquisition of complete ownership of a significant portion of a major natural resource of St. Thomas, waterfront land in the harbour, by a foreign economic interest which is exempt from the normal regulatory processes of our Government.

(Mrs. Bourne)

The people of the Virgin Islands have found hope in the fact that the United Nations has taken note of this situation, and we trust that the urging of the United Nations will persuade the administering Power to abandon its current hands-off posture. As I have detailed, the representation that the Territorial Government has full regulatory powers over the area is inaccurate.

(Mrs. Bourne)

If the suggestion of the use of the power of eminent domain made by the United States Department of State to the Congressional Delegate is to be seriously considered, the administering Power must assist the Territory in obtaining the necessary resources. In the wake of hurrican Hugo, all normal - and some extraordinary - sources of financial assistance must go to the rebuilding and recovery process. However, in striving to attend to critical and immediate needs, we must not overlook those issues with implications for both sovereignty and long-term consequences.

Hurricane Hugo has created a situation in which the most opportune time to negotiate the best price is also the time when the Territory has no resources of its own to consummate such a purchase. Clearly, now is the time for the administering Power to assist the Government and the people of the United States Virgin Islands in regaining the ownership and control of this land which would normally be considered public trust land.

We therefore ask this Committee to include in its report its continuing recognition of the concern of the Save Long Bay Coalition, Inc. and the concern of the Government of the United States Virgin Islands as expressed in the Governor's letter, read to the Fourth Committee last October, regarding the activities of the West Indian Company, Ltd., a Danish-owned development company, in the reclamation and development of submerged land at Long Bay in the Charlotte Amalie Harbour. The statement concerning the regulatory power of the territorial government must be corrected, and we ask that the importance and urgency of this matter be reflected by the inclusion of an operative paragraph urging the administering Power to assist the Government of the Virgin Islands to resolve this situation through the use of the power of eminent domain as suggested by the administering Power and as advocated by the Government of the Territory.

(Mrs. Bourne)

Such action would also be in conformity with the responsibilities of the administering Power towards the Territory and would constitute positive implementation of resolution 43/44.

The reference to the search for external resources by the territorial government to acquire the property without reference to the complete lack of success of this unassisted effort implies a situation with a much more positive outlook than is in fact the case. We ask that that portion of the report also be modified.

Once again, on behalf of the Save Long Bay Coalition and of the people of the Virgin Islands, I thank the Committee for this opportunity to address this body on this issue, consideration of which is particularly pertinent at this time.

The CHAIRMAN: Does any member wish to make comments or to put questions to Mrs. Bourne?

As this is not the case, the petitioner may now withdraw.

The petitioner withdrew.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Glenn H. Alcalay, National Committee for Radiation Victims, took a place at the petitioners' table.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on Mr. Alcalay.

Mr. ALCALAY: As a representative of the National Committee for Radiation Victims, I wish to thank the Special Committee for the opportunity to appear before it once again concerning the current situation in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the last remaining Trust Territory. Having recently returned from the Republic of the Marshall Islands, in Micronesia, I shall base my remarks and comments on the insights and information gathered during my recent three-week visit in May.

A United States Department of Energey (DOE) document has surfaced regarding a United States contingency plan to resume atmospheric nuclear testing in the

(Mr. Alcalay)

Marshall Islands. In what has been referred to as the Safeguard "C" memorandum of 23 March 1982, Herman Roser, Assistant Secretary for Defense Programs for the Department of Energy, laid bare a secret scheme for the possible resumption of above-ground nuclear testing in the already contaminated Marshall Islands. I quote from that document:

"When the DOE was created in 1977, responsibility for the Marshall Islands' program was assigned to Environmental Protection. With the exception of the professional medical capability, the technical resources that are in use in the Marshall Islands are largely weapons-related programs, and most of the DOE's logistic and support base is common to the Safeguard 'C' readiness program. Safeguard 'C' is one of the four safeguards in the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty and requires the U.S. to maintain the capability to resume atmospheric testing. In fact, much of the field effort in the Marshall Islands is an exercise of the expeditionary capability which is an important aspect of the Defense Programs' Safeguard 'C'."

In his 3 May letter to Marshall Islands President Amata Kabua, Rongelap Senator Jeton Anjain stated that

"the Marshall Islands were maintained as a test site - a very special kind of test site - only the nature of the test has changed. From testing bombs and weapons, DOE undertook long-term human and environmental testing so they" - the Administering Authority - "would understand the long-term effects of radiation should the U.S. be required by political or military circumstances to use such weapons again in the future."

Senator Anjain of Rongelap also requested in his letter to the President that he file

"a diplomatic protest with the U.S. Government in the appropriate manner in which you" - the President - "on behalf of Rongelap and all other Marshallese

(Mr. Alcalay)

people, demand a full and complete accounting of what the Department of Energy did, why they did it, and why it was kept secret".

Senator Anjain also asked President Kabua to inquire if Safeguard "C" violates the letter and the spirit of the Compact of Free Association, which distinctly prohibits the "detonation of any nuclear weapon" in the Marshall Islands.

While in Majuro and Ebeye during the release of the Safeguard "C" document in May, and as publicized by a headline story in the 11 May 1990 Marshall Islands Journal, it was my impression - and I should add that I am a fluent speaker of the Marshallese language - that most Marshallese I encountered, including several senators to the Nitajela - the Parliament - some Cabinet members, traditional iroij - chiefs - and ordinary Marshallese were stunned by this newest revelation about the hidden United States strategic agenda in their islands.

To date, the only response about the Safeguard "C" document by the Administering Authority has been in the form of a lengthy letter reprinted in the 8 June 1990 Marshall Islands Journal. In this reply by the Administering Authority, the substantive issues raised by the Safeguard "C" document are obfuscated by murky rhetoric. The all-important issue about the Administering Authority's plan to potentially resume atmospheric nuclear testing in the Marshalls, and whether this violates the terms of the Compact of Free Association, is conspicuously missing from the Administering Authority's inadequate reply. Not surprisingly, many in the Marshall Islands, after the release of the Safeguard "C" document, question the Administering Authority's nuclear intransigence and the further threatened assault on their sovereignty as a fledgling republic.

(Mr. Alcalay)

Quite recently two independent researchers discovered that the spread of cesium-137 was far more extensive than had been previously believed. Cesium, a human-made isotope from the nuclear-weapons programme, was discovered on six atolls in the northern Marshalls - in addition to Bikini, Enewetak, Rongelap and Utirik - by health physicist Nathan Greenhouse and epidemiologist Thomas Hamilton. This finding suggests that the health and environmental damage from the nuclear-testing era is still erupting as we move into the twenty-first century. Added to this is the recent United States National Academy of Science's BEIR V (Biological Effects of Ionizing Radiation) report, which states that exposure to low doses of ionizing radiation is between three and five times more dangerous than had been previously believed. This is not good news for the Marshall Islanders.

It is hardly any wonder, then, that the Administering Authority worked so diligently to remove the more than $5 billion in lawsuits brought by the Marshallese under the so-called espousal clause of section 177 of the Compact. Even the Trusteeship Council's own Visiting Mission to the September 1983 Marshall Islands plebiscite stated that

> "The United States insists upon the espousal of claims and has stated there cannot be a compact of free association for the Marshall Islands without a radiation agreement (section 177) that includes espousal". (T/1865, annex IV, para. 2)

In fact, the Visiting Mission concluded that

> "No other subject attracted comparable attention in the campaign ...". (T/1865, para. 30)

While in Mejato with Senator Anjain in late May, we learned that several Rongelap islanders are considering yet another move, to Eneko Island in Majuro atoll. The feeling by many Rongelap people in Mejato is that medical emergencies

(Mr. Alcalay)

will be easier to deal with if the people are closer to the facilities on Majuro, which are more adequate than those on Ebeye. Additionally, it is universally felt that Mejato is only a temporary move in a culture where land means everything, and "A Marshallese without land is no Marshallese at all". This further threatened sociological dislocation and uncertainty - in the midst of the Bikini and Enewetak dislocations - loudly bespeaks the great and historical distrust between the United States Government, and in particular the Department of Energy, and people who were on the receiving end of the United States hydrogen-bomb programme.

We have heard of the plan to ship household garbage from the west coast of the United States to the Marshall Islands. During a rift between the principal heads of the Seattle-based Admiralty Pacific Company last year, it was learned that the supposedly benign household garbage - which will contain toxic leachates - was intended to hide shipments of nuclear waste from a New Jersey company. Following his exposure of the nuclear-waste plan, Daniel Fleming broke with Admiralty Pacific, started his own company, called "MicroMar", in Oakland, California, and is moving ahead to ship west-coast household garbage as in the original plan.

James Thompson of Admiralty Pacific - obviously feeling the fallout over the proposed nuclear-waste scheme - has now switched to selling mountains of used tires from Canada and the United States to form artificial reefs in the Marshall Islands. Now, as any ship captain who has had to manoeuvre delicately through the treacherous shoals and coral heads throughout the Marshall Islands can readily tell you, about the last thing the Marshall Islanders need is more reefs. More than 40 other third-world nations - including several cash-poor Pacific island nations - rejected the garbage plan outright. That should tell us something about the way in which great economic dependency, intentionally instituted, as detailed in the infamous Solomon report of 1963, plays out in the real world in the neo-colonial era in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

(Mr. Alcalay)

And in addition to their feelings about the artificial reefs being proposed by Admiralty Pacific and MicroMar, the overwhelming sentiment by many Marshallese political and business leaders I recently encountered concerns the great uncertainty that awaits them as the Compact spigot runs dry in the year 2001. Built upon an artificial reef of annual cash infusions from the United States Treasury, the artificial and asymmetric economy of the Marshall Islands opens some island leaders up to preposterous and potentially catastrophic schemes, such as accepting first-world garbage, in opposition to the region's vast consensus and the United Nations Environment Programme's concern about the international waste trade, which always ends up in the third world.

While in the Marshall Islands recently, I was deluged by the opinion that "Ebeye has been really turned around compared to just five years ago". Well, I was in Ebeye 5 years ago, and I was also in Ebeye 10 and 15 years ago. It must be stated from the outset that Mayor Alvin Jacklick and the rest of his Kwajalein atoll local government have done a Herculean job of bringing water, electricity, and a paved road and a sidewalk to the "Slum of the Pacific", and therefore deserve all of the credit for turning this inhospitable island into a little-less-inhospitable place. But Ebeye is still Ebeye, where throngs of young children play in the streets, dodging the endless stream of cars and taxis because they have no other place to play and recreate. With 55 per cent of the Marshallese population of 50,000 - and 55 per cent of Ebeye's population of 10,000 - 14 years of age or younger, we are looking at a demographic time bomb that threatens to explode in the immediate future.

Ebeye - with its unprecedented male suicide epidemic; high unemployment rate, and the accompanying boredom; cramped packing-crate houses, where it is common for a family of 12 to live in a single room; increasing crime and violence; and looming despair and degradation - is an aberration throughout the entire Pacific region and

(Mr. Alcalay)

exists solely because of the United States missile base at Kwajalein: if there were no missile base, there would be no Ebeye. As a social scientist long concerned about the appalling conditions at Ebeye, I have believed that the furtherance of United States strategic interests should not be carried out on the backs of the Marshallese or any other people, of a society already reeling from the effects - many of which are still unknown - of nuclear testing and massive sociological dislocation. Perhaps as the cold war winds down, the Administering Authority will come to see the wisdom of phasing out its Kwajalein programmes, both to reduce super-Power tensions and, likewise, to benefit Marshallese society and culture by severely reducing the United States military presence in the region. Radically changed times require radically new thinking, and a United States pull-back from Kwajalein is appropriate at this time.

And as the cold war appears to thaw, the good news is that recent arms agreements between the United States and the Soviet Union concerning chemical weapons have allowed for the removal of these ghastly weapons from West Germany. The bad news, however, is that the peoples of the Pacific will be forced to endure the potential for environmental contamination as these decommissioned chemical weapons are incinerated in the atmosphere at Johnston atoll, a United States possession about 700 miles south-west of Hawaii.

A scientific report by Greenpeace International seriously challenges the United States Army's assessment of potential risk for those populations living downwind of Johnston atoll. In the immediate path of the air-borne release of dioxins and furans are Hawaii and the Republic of the Marshall Islands. Following public hearings and protest rallies, Hawaii State Senator Donna Ikeda has introduced a resolution into the Hawaii State Senate opposing the shipment of weapons and fast-killing nerve agents from Europe.

(Mr. Alcalay)

Similarly, Marshallese Senator Kesai Note, the Speaker of Parliament, has written a letter of protest to President Bush about the plan to incinerate those deadly chemical weapons upwind from the Marshall Islands. Still suffering from the still inadequately understood long-term effects of nuclear testing, the Marshall Islanders may experience a sense of déjà vu if the plan to burn chemical weapons proceeds.

In addition, the 15 member nations of the South Pacific Forum are currently finalizing their twenty-first annual meeting in Vanuatu, and a strongly worded resolution in opposition to the Johnston Atoll incineration plan is anticipated. Following centuries of colonialism, the island peoples of the Pacific understand all too well the dangers associated with first-world dumping of toxic wastes in their once pristine oceanic habitat.

More recently, a diplomatic flap has exploded over the territorial status of Wake Island, a strategic United States naval and air base, as well as a key site for naval - including nuclear submarines - and space communications. In a unilateral act by the Administering Authority, Wake was "given" to Guam, despite the fact that the Government of the Marshall Islands claims ancestral ties to Wake, a subject to which I shall return shortly.

Concerning Palau, the recent Palau plebiscite of 6 February - whereby the Compact received the lowest voter support yet - demonstrates that where the will of a people confronts the greatest military might, as the United States painfully learned in Vietnam, the will of the people shall prevail. It can only be hoped that the Administering Authority will take a lesson from the Soviet Union's action - whereby President Mikhail Gorbachev unilaterally cut the Soviet military presence at Cam Ranh Bay in Viet Nam - and likewise draw down United States forces and bases in the Asia-Pacific region to bolster international security in the increasingly amiable and hopeful climate between the super-Powers.

(Mr. Alcalay)

In that light, Wake Island reminds us that the cold war is a hard habit to shake. A passage from a recent exchange between two journalists - Paul Wiseman of USA Today and Tom Panholzer of Gannett - should give us cause for concern.

"If you look at a map of the Pacific, you will see that if Guam has claim to Wake and its two sister islands, Wilkes and Peale, then the United States will have an exclusive economic zone from Hawaii to Guam. This would be a band stretching nearly clear across the Pacific, broken only in a couple of places. Furthermore, this not only would prevent the Chamorros from gaining independence from the United States but would give the handful of residents there who want statehood a stronger argument. Indeed, the United States would never give up Guam then, simply because this exclusive economic zone would provide an excuse to keep a large Pacific fleet, as well as control over some very rich fishing and possible mineral fields". (Marshall Islands Journal, 6 July 1990)

In conclusion, I offer the following recommendations concerning the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands:

First, the Administering Authority, and the United States Congress in particular, should release the funding for the Phase II Rongelap independent assessment to ascertain whether Rongelap Atoll is safe for the inhabitants to return or whether those unfortunate people must now and forever abandon any prospect of safely returning home to resume their livelihoods.

Secondly, I urge the Administering Authority to consider expanding the Section 177 nuclear trust fund in the Compact if it is demonstrated that the radioactive fallout contamination is far more extensive than previously reported.

Thirdly, I request that the Administering Authority should abandon the Palau Compact and commence negotiations for true self-determination as an act of good faith by the United States Government in the light of the now ludicrous series of

(Mr. Alcalay)

failed plebiscites, and in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations, General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960 and the declared United Nations International Decade for the Eradication of Colonialism.

Lastly, I wish to draw the attention of the Special Committee to an upcoming television programme. The programme, ABC's "Prime Time Live", features the Marshall Islands and is set to air Thursday, 9 August, which is also Nagasaki Day.

Mr. ALARCON de QUESADA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation would like to thank the petitioner from the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands for his important statement. I think he has given us much information of interest to our Committee in its work. I believe that the information reveals, to an extent not clearly perceived at the outset, some truly tragic aspects of colonialism that affect not only the rights of peoples but also the environment and the rights of individuals, even their very existence.

I believe that both this petitioner's presentation and the one we heard from the petitioner from the United States Virgin Islands serve to remind us of the Committee's duty to analyse in depth the situation of all the Territories that have not yet achieved independence and to devote the most careful attention to each and every one, simply because they are small or far from the traditional centres of power, or because they are island Territories or have little territory or population, the anti-colonial principles binding on this Committee do not lose any of their validity, as you, Mr. Chairman, said in your opening statement.

It is truly instructive to see, on the one hand, how colonial realities continue to force some peoples to suffer the consequences of the confrontation between the great Powers, the cold war, militarization and the like, while they have yet to see the benefits of changes in direction and the relaxation of international tensions in other parts of the world. We also see Territories that continue to be used as sites for the use of arms or substances which the

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

administering Powers themselves would like to keep from their own frontiers or as dumping grounds for substances which are harmful to the population and the environment. On the other hand - and here, in conclusion, I should like to comment on the statement of the petitioner from the United States Virgin Islands - my delegation has noted with some surprise the fact that not only with respect to that Territory but also with respect to other Territories in the Caribbean, there is talk even now about the destruction caused by Hurricane Hugo. The international community and the Administering Authority still must be urged to take effective measures to rehabilitate and rebuild those Territories.

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

I come from a Caribbean country, and for centuries the hurricane season has been a constant factor in Caribbean life. I call members' attention to the fact that we are once again in the hurricane season. I wonder what would happen if any of these Territories should be hit by another hurricane, as usually happens every year? What would be the consequences for the population? What would be the harmful effects on the economy, on society, etc.?

The morality of colonialism is very surprising in this regard. On the one hand, the colonialists regard our Territories as dumping grounds for their toxic substances and, on the other, they are incapable of carrying out their obvious obligation to repair the damage nature can inflict on small Caribbean Territories.

If we take a look at the true situation in the Caribbean, we see how the independent States of the region can, in general, deal in a more effective way with these annual regional phenomena. If the colonialists are incapable of rescuing or helping these people when they suffer natural disasters, the solution is very simple: no one is forcing the colonialists from the north to install themselves in the Caribbean. The Caribbean has been and continues to be a region lashed by hurricanes during a season running approximately from July to November or December.

With these general comments, we wanted to take the opportunity to express our concern when, as the next hurricane season is upon us, we see that the damage from a hurricane last year is still being highlighted in the reports now before the Committee and in the just calls we have heard from the petitioners.

The CHAIRMAN: I am sure members of the Committee will take note of the views expressed in their consideration of the various Territories, particularly in their endeavour to promote the well-being and welfare of the peoples concerned.

I now invite Mr. Alcalay to withdraw.

Mr. Alcalay withdrew.

QUESTION OF ANGUILLA: REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE ON SMALL TERRITORIES (A/AC.109/L.1726)

QUESTION OF BERMUDA: REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE ON SMALL TERRITORIES (A/AC.109/L.1727)

QUESTION OF THE BRITISH VIRGIN ISLANDS: REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE ON SMALL TERRITORIES (A/AC.109/L.1728)

QUESTON OF THE CAYMAN ISLANDS: REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE ON SMALL TERRITORIES (A/AC.109/L.1729)

QUESTION OF MONTSERRAT: REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE ON SMALL TERRITORIES (A/AC.109/L.1730)

QUESTION OF PITCAIRN: REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE ON SMALL TERRITORIES (A/AC.109/L.1731)

QUESTION OF ST. HELENA: REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE ON SMALL TERRITORIES (A/AC.109/L.1732)

QUESTION OF THE TURKS AND CAICOS ISLANDS: REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE ON SMALL TERRITORIES (A/AC.109/L.1733)

QUESTION OF TOKELAU: REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE ON SMALL TERRITORIES (A/AC.109/L.1734)

QUESTION OF AMERICAN SAMOA: REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE ON SMALL TERRITORIES (A/AC.109/L.1735)

QUESTION OF GUAM: REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE ON SMALL TERRITORIES (A/AC.109/L.1736 and Corr.1)

QUESTON OF THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS: REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE ON SMALL TERRITORIES (A/AC.109/L.1737)

QUESTION OF THE UNITED STATES VIRGIN ISLANDS: REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE ON SMALL TERRITORIES (A/AC.109/L.1738)

The CHAIRMAN: Items 3 to 15 listed on the agenda of this meeting relate to Territories that have been the subject of consideration by the Sub-Committee on Small Territories.

To introduce the reports of the Sub-Committee relating to these items, I now call on the Rapporteur of the Sub-Committee, Mr. Dag Mjaaland of Norway.

Mr. MJAALAND (Norway); Rapporteur of the Sub-Committee on Small Territories: I have the honour to commend for adoption by the Special Committee on the Situation with Regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples the reports of the Sub-Committee on Small Territories concerning the Territories of Anguilla, Bermuda, the British Virgin Islands, the Cayman Islands, Montserrat, Pitcairn, St. Helena, the Turks and Caicos Islands, Tokelau, American Samoa, Guam, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and the United States Virgin Islands. The reports are contained in documents A/AC.109/L.1726 to L.1738.

I should like to point out that one of the reports, that on St. Helena, contained in document A/AC.109/L.1732, erroneously states that the representative of Norway expressed the reservation of his delegation concerning paragraph 9 (5) and (8). The Norwegian reservation extended only to paragraph 9 (8).

Otherwise, the conclusions and recommendations as arrived at reflect the sentiments of the members of the Sub-Committee with regard to the situation in those Territories, and I recommend that the Special Committee adopt these reports by consensus and endorse the conclusions and recommendations contained therein.

The CHAIRMAN: I am sure the points raised by the Rapporteur in his introductory remarks will be noted.

I wish to inform members that I have received a request from Mr. Carlyle Corbin, representative of the Governor of the United States Virgin Islands, to make a statement at this stage.

Subject to members' consent, and in accordance with standing procedure, I suggest that the Committee invite him to make a statement at this point.

It was so decided.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Corbin took a place at the Committee table.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on Mr. Corbin.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, as this is the first opportunity for my Government to address the Committee in 1990, please permit me to extend, on behalf of our Government, congratulations to you upon your election to lead the most important work of the Committee. Your proven diplomatic skills and abilities have been displayed over the years you have served as Chairman, and should prove invaluable as we proceed in the most important work of the Committee in this the year of the thirtieth anniversary of the Declaration on decolonization. I should also like to thank you for the opportunity to address the Committee once more.

At this stage, I should like to express the solidarity of my Government and of the people of the United States Virgin Islands with the Government and the people of Trinidad and Tobago and with the people of Liberia regarding the continuing crises in those countries.

Before focusing on the report of the Sub-Committee on Small Territories, I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate you further, Mr. Chairman, for successfully conducting the two seminars on decolonization held in Vanuatu and Barbados and attended by representatives of the Governments of Non-Self-Governing Territories, non-governmental organizations and regional institutions, as well as invited guests.

I should also like to express the gratitude of my Government to the Governments of Vanuatu and Barbados for providing the participants with excellent facilities for the important deliberations and extending the fine hospitality for which the Pacific and Caribbean peoples are so noted.

(Mr. Corbin)

A number of recommendations emerging from the seminars are of specific relevance to the ongoing work of the Committee and could prove useful as we undergo the self-examination process in this thirtieth anniversary year, leading to the institution of measures for the eradication of colonialism in this decade, pursuant to the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly. You outlined many of these key provisions in your statement earlier this morning, Sir, and permit me to highlight a few others.

Participants at these seminars expressed the view that the full objectives of the Declaration had not been met and that the decolonization process had therefore not yet been completed. They reaffirmed their commitment to the elimination of colonialism and to the principles contained in General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV) and 1541 (XV).

The participants also supported the role of the Committee in the process. They emphasized, however, that a great deal remains to be done in order to achieve the objectives of the Declaration.

With respect to political and constitutional development, participants at both seminars re-emphasized that all peoples have the right to self-determination and that it was the peoples of the Territories themselves who must exercise that right through a free expression of their will and with complete knowledge and awareness of the options available to them.

(Mr. Corbin)

In this respect, it was also stressed that the transfer of powers to the Territories is a prerequisite to a legitimate act of self-determination, that the importance of a fair and unbiased political education programme is crucial if an informed decision is to be made by the people and that this education programme must be undertaken in conformity with General Assembly resolution 1541 (XV), which recognized the three options of integration, free association or independence as the legitimate choices pursuant to international law.

Participants agreed that the United Nations should institute a world-wide programme on dissemination of information on decolonization to enhance the political education of the peoples of the Territories themselves, with a view to raising the awareness of the people about their political rights and the options available to them in determining their future status.

Participants stressed that every support should be given to the strong desire which currently exists in some Territories for a more rapid and progressive move to full internal self-government without preconditions, so that the people of those Territories can assume greater responsibilities for managing their own affairs, leading to the culmination of the self-determination process. In this regard, it was deemed essential that the United Nations should be called upon to observe the final act of self-determination in those Territories.

Participants also called for necessary measures to be taken by the Administering Authorities, in co-operation with the Territorial Governments and the specialized agencies of the United Nations, to facilitate a sustained and balanced growth of the fragile economies of the remaining Territories and to identify assistance in the development of all sectors of those economies.

With respect to the United Nations process, participants reaffirmed the necessity for the submission of full, updated and adequate information to the

(Mr. Corbin)

United Nations on the Territories in a timely fashion, as required under Article 73 e of the Charter, and supported the continuation of United Nations visiting missions.

The CHAIRMAN: I am sorry to interrupt you, Mr. Corbin. You know as well as we do that the seminars were carried out. They have their respective organizations, with their own rapporteurs. The documentation is ready and will be issued tomorrow, as I indicated a bit earlier. What you are really telling us now is a substantive part of that documentation. Therefore, I would suggest that, not only for brevity but also to avoid repetition, you should adhere to those points that would be helpful in terms of adding new information concerning a particular Territory or particular issues of concern, so that we may be able to benefit from your statement.

Mr. CORBIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I did not mean to pre-empt the publication of the summary of proceedings, although the summary of proceedings does have a very distinct impact upon the Sub-Committee report which is before this Committee today and which will ultimately be adopted today. However, in the light of your statement, I shall proceed and will omit that aspect of the statement.

The recommendations that will be dealt with tomorrow are extremely significant, since they represent the collective expression of the will of the people of the Territories and how the people of the Territories feel about the development of future political, economic and social systems, in the spirit of the great Julius Nyerere, who noted that: "A people cannot be developed, they can only develop themselves".

It is not surprising, then, that a number of these recommendations follow closely the language and spirit of the many resolutions which have been adopted by the General Assembly, originating in the Sub-Committee on Small Territories, since

(Mr. Corbin)

the directives expressed in those resolutions, if properly implemented, would promote the speedy end of colonialism.

In this manner, the work of this Committee is perhaps more crucial now than at any time in recent history, as we have entered what can be considered the final phase of the decolonization process, with a concentration now on the small island Non-Self-Governing Territories in the Caribbean and the Pacific.

This Special Committee on Decolonization and the Council for Namibia deserve the highest commendation for their diligence and perseverance in the face of long and difficult odds in fostering the emergence of the new nation of Namibia. This Committee should bear in mind, however, that the decolonization era did not end with the independence of Namibia but has merely taken on a new dimension, requiring innovative means to address the contemporary situation in the remaining Territories, which are mostly small island developing countries, and we must reaffirm the principles enshrined in the Charter, in General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV) and 1541 (XV) and in other relevant resolutions, which continue to serve as the legal basis for the decolonziation process.

International law holds that the basis for the relationship between a Non-Self-Governing Territory and the Administering Authority is a function of the United Nations Charter. Yet, the constitutional mechanisms often used to govern that relationship - for example, as in the case of the Virgin Islands - emanate not from international law but rather from the domestic law of the Administering Authority, as if those territories were integrated parts of the Administering Authority, in such a manner that the final determination in interpreting or modifying the political status of the Territory rests not with the Territory itself but rather with the Administering Authority. The Territories, therefore, need clarification on how international law is supposed to apply to that relationship, in conformity with resolutions of the General Assembly, from the twenty-ninth

(Mr. Corbin)

through the forty-fourth sessions, on the international legal principle of self-determination, as well as with resolutions calling for full and meaningful discussion on political status for the creation of an awareness among the people of the available options and for facilitating political education programmes consistent with international law.

The political education process currently being implemented in the Territory is being carried out without reference to international law, because the people of the Territory are not aware of how this is supposed to apply to their political development process. Again, we seek guidance from the Committee in this respect.

In order to clarify these matters, beginning with the fundamental question of who should be eligible to participate in a referendum if it is to be considered a valid act of self-determination, my Government made a request of this Committee last year for a legal opinion to determine whether an international legal standard for residency requirements exists for participation in acts of self-determination in Non-Self-Governing Territories.

Our request was based on the concern that the applicability of current Administering Authority law to the Territory prohibits the Territory from instituting a reasonable residency requirement for voting in elections. Current Territorial law allows any Administering Authority national who has resided in the Territory for 90 days to be eligible to vote in Territorial elections, including referendums on political status, a situation which has been the subject of considerable debate in the Territory.

My Government is mindful of the fact that special residency requirements were instituted for acts of self-determination in other Non-Self-Governing Territories, such as Western Sahara, Namibia and New Caledonia, so it was a logical deduction that there was a role for international law in our process as well.

(Mr. Corbin)

We were also mindful of the appropriate provisions of the General Assembly's 1980 Plan of Action for the Full Implementation of the Declaration on decolonization. Accordingly, we therefore recommend that the Committee should, in conjunction with the International Law Commission, the International Court of Justice and/or other relevant organs of the United Nations and the Non-Self-Governing Territory Governments, conduct a comprehensive study on the relationship of international law to the decolonization of the remaining Territories, so that we in the Territories will know what to expect, will know what is supposed to apply to us, and perhaps what is not, as we try to inform our people of their options and as we move towards more self-government, leading to a political-status referendum, tentatively scheduled for June next year.

It is important to note that representatives of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, in prepared statements to the Trusteeship Council on 24 May of this year, called for an advisory opinion from the International Court of Justice on the applicability of international law to the interpretation of their political status, for they face the same difficulties. My Government supports the request of the people of the Northern Mariana Islands for that international legal clarification and trust that the Trusteeship Council will act accordingly. We therefore also call on this Committee to advise us on this fundamental matter, using the United Nations system, which it has at its disposal.

It is in the light of those factors, including the ones you raised in your statement, Mr. Chairman, that we must consider the reports of the Sub-Committee. I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the Chairman of the Sub-Committee on Small Territories, Mr. Ghazi Jomaa of Tunisia, the Rapporteur, Mr. Dag Mjaaland of Norway, and the other members of the Sub-Committee on their excellent work in

(Mr. Corbin)

examining the many complex issues in the Non-Self-Governing Territories during the sessions held in the spring. I also congratulate the Sub-Committee on the approval of an excellent report on the United States Virgin Islands, which is unparalleled in its detail on and relevance to, the current situation in the Territory.

As a number of developments have taken place since the approval of the report on 14 June, the Committee may wish to consider a few recommendations by my Government for enhancing and updating the report before the Committee approves it, in the light of the fact that the Committee will be adopting the report today.

The fifth of the Sub-Committee's conclusions and recommendations deals with the rescheduling of the political-status referendum. My Government recommends that the last sentence of that paragraph should be amended. It currently reads:

"The Committee also notes that provision has been made for a further run-off election in December 1991."

We suggest adding the following words:

"and that the results of the referendum are not binding on the Administering Authority."

That language makes clear the non-binding nature of the referendum, scheduled for June 1991.

The seventh of the conclusions and recommendations deals with the question of the relevance of international law to the self-determination process. It is our recommendation that the second sentence should be amended, with the addition of the following words:

"and will initiate a study in consultation with the relevant United Nations organs and the territorial Government on the relevance of international law to the self-determination process, for completion at least six months prior to the scheduled referendum in the Territory."

(Mr. Corbin)

The six month period is important, since any changes in the local and Territorial law applied to the referendum would have to be made in a short period of time.

Additionally, my Government recommends that the last sentence, dealing with "relevant ... resolutions regarding acts of self-determination", should be amended by adding:

"including the 1980 Plan of Action for the Full Implementation of the Declaration".

The ninth of the conclusions and recommendations deals with the need for effective measures to safeguard and guarantee the inalienable right of the people to own and control their natural resources. It is our recommendation that the following words should be added:

"in conformity with the relevant resolution of the Final Act of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea".

That is language to which you referred in your opening statement, Mr. Chairman.

The twelfth of the conclusions and recommendations deals with assistance to the Territory following the destruction caused by hurricane Hugo. We recommend adding the following sentence:

"The Committee calls on the United Nations Disaster Relief Office (UNDRO) to facilitate the direct participation of the Territory in programmes of the International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction."

The seventeenth of the conclusions and recommendations in the Sub-Committee report, dealing with the question of visiting missions, begins

"Mindful that United Nations visiting missions provide an effective means of assessing the situation in the Non-Self-Governing Territories".

My Government recommends adding the following words:

(Mr. Corbin)

"further mindful that the Territorial Government had made a request for a visiting mission in 1989 to observe the political education process". That information was contained in public documents in the Territory.

My Government requests the Committee to consider those amendments to the Sub-Committee report in the short time available, in the interest of updating and clarifying its contents.

I once again apologize to you, Mr. Chairman, for having pre-empted the document on the seminar. However, it was important that the connection should be made between the seminar's recommendations and the reports that are to be approved today.

My Government appreciates this opportunity to participate in the Committee's work. I am prepared at this time to answer questions from Committee members.

The CHAIRMAN: On behalf of the Committee, I wish to thank Mr. Corbin for the information he has furnished. The views he has expressed will be taken into account in connection with the consideration of the relevant item.

If there are no questions or comments, Mr. Corbin may now withdraw.

Mr. Corbin withdrew.

The CHAIRMAN: Before we take up the reports dealing with the different Territories, I wish to welcome among us the representatives of the administering Powers - New Zealand, the United States and Portugal - who have been participating in the Sub-Committee's consideration of these items.

We shall first take up the report relating to Anguilla, contained in document A/AC.109/L.1726.

If there are no comments, may I take it that the Committee adopts the report and approves the conclusions and recommendations contained therein?

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has thus concluded consideration of the item.

We shall next take up the report relating to Bermuda, contained in document A/AC.109/L.1727.

If there are no comments, may I take it that the Committee adopts the report and approves the conclusions and recommendations contained therein?

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has thus concluded consideration of the item.

We shall next take up the report relating to the British Virgin Islands, contained in document A/AC.109/L.1728.

If there are no comments, may I take it that the Committee adopts the report and approves the conclusions and recommendations contained therein?

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has thus concluded consideration of the item.

We shall next take up the report relating to the Cayman Islands, contained in document A/AC.109/L.1729.

If there are no comments, may I take it that the Committee adopts the report and approves the conclusions and recommendations contained therein?

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has thus concluded consideration of the item.

We shall next take up the report relating to Montserrat, contained in document A/AC.109/L.1730.

If there are no comments, may it take it that the Committee adopts the report and approves the conclusions and recommendations contained therein?

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has thus concluded consideration of the item.

We shall next take up the report relating to Pitcairn, contained in document A/AC.109/L.1731.

(The Chairman)

If there are no comments, may I take it that the Committee adopts the report and approves the draft consensus contained therein?

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has thus concluded consideration of the item.

We shall next take up the report relating to St. Helena, contained in document A/AC.109/L.1732.

Mr. BERGH JOHANSEN (Norway): The Norwegian position on the issue of Ascension Island has been stated during previous sessions of the Sub-Committee on Small Territories.

As members are aware, it is our view that Ascension Island does not fall under the provisions of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), which is the basis for the work of this Committee, because the island has no population of its own. Nor can it be said that Ascension Island belongs to St. Helena. The ties between these two islands are of a practical and administrative nature. When the people of St. Helena exercise their right to self-determination, that act will not have implications on the status of Ascension Island.

The legitimate reason for this Committee's interest in Ascension Island and its inclusion in the working paper of the Secretariat is the employment possibilities the island constitutes for the inhabitants of St. Helena. However, in our view, the fact that Ascension Island is mentioned in the working paper does not give us the members of this Committee the right to pronounce ourselves on Ascension Island.

My delegation is therefore strongly opposed to the inclusion of the paragraph concerning Ascension Island.

Furthermore, my delegation would like to take exception to the implication in the report that the Territory could somehow be involved in offensive acts or interference against neighbouring States.

(Mr. Bergh Johansen, Norway)

I therefore enter a formal reservation with regard to paragraph 9, sub-paragraph (8) of the report. My delegation also takes exception to the wording of paragraph 9, sub-paragraph (5), without entering a formal reservation in this respect.

The CHAIRMAN: If there are no further comments, may I take it that the Committee adopts the report and approves the conclusions and recommendations contained therein, it being understood that the reservations expressed will be reflected in the record of the meeting?

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has thus concluded consideration of the item.

We shall next take up the report relating to the Turks and Caicos Islands, contained in document A/AC.109/L.1733.

If there are no comments, may I take it that the Committee adopts the report and approves the conclusions and recommendatins contained therein?

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has thus concluded consideration of the item.

We shall next take up the report relating to Tokelau, contained in document A/AC.109/L.1734.

I call on the representative of New Zealand.

Mr. KEMBER (New Zealand): I thank you, Mr. Chairman, and the other members of the Committee for allowing us to take the floor.

I wish to offer my delegation's congratulations to the Sub-Committee on Small Territories, in particular to its Chairman, Mr. Ghazi Jomaa of Tunisia, and its Rapporteur, Mr. Dag Mjaaland of Norway, on the Sub-Committee's work as represented in this report.

(Mr. Kember, New Zealand)

As members know, both New Zealand, as the administering Power, and the people of Tokelau attach great importance to the work of the Committee, and as the Sub-Committee's report notes, it was possible this year for a representative of Tokelau to appear before the Sub-Committee, a departure which both we and the people of Tokelau regard as particularly important.

With the Committee's indulgence - since this really relates to our overall work in appearing before the Sub-Committee - may I draw attention to an error in document A/AC.109/1039 relating to transmission of information under Article 73 e of the Charter. I should like to point out that, as part of our work in co-operating with this Committee, six copies of the report of the Administrator of Tokelau were presented to the Secretary-General on 29 May this year, as well as a further six copies which were forwarded to you, Mr. Chairman. We should be grateful for this error to be corrected in due course.

The CHAIRMAN: The error just indicated by the representative of New Zealand will be rectified in due course.

If there are no further comments, may I take it that the Committee adopts the report and approves the conclusions and recommendations contained therein?

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has thus concluded its consideration of the item.

We shall now take up the report (A/AC.109/L.1735) relating to American Samoa.

As there appear to be no comments, may I take it that the Committee adopts the report and approves the conclusions and recommendations contained therein?

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has thus concluded its consideration of the item.

We shall next take up the report (A/AC.109/L.1736 and Corr.1) relating to Guam. Are there any comments?

Ms. BONEPARTH (United States of America): I appreciate the opportunity of participating in this meeting.

I must confess that, being new to the Committee, I was not prepared for the speed with which it has proceeded this morning. Therefore, I am wondering if it would be possible to defer until the next meeting consideration of this report of the Sub-Committee, since I should like to make some comments but should prefer to consult with my Mission before doing so.

The CHAIRMAN: If the Committee agrees, we shall defer this item and go on to deal with the remaining reports under agenda item 3.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall therefore take up the report relating to Guam at an appropriate stage later in the session.

We shall now take up the report (A/AC.109/L.1737) relating to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Are there any comments?

Mr. CISTERNAS (Chile) (interpretation from Spanish): The Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is, in accordance with the relevant resolution adopted by the United Nations, a strategic Territory. As such, it is within the competence of the Trusteeship Council to consider the situation of the Territory and its population.

The Security Council, assisted by the Trusteeship Council, has the final authority to decide on the Territory's future.

Hence, my delegation feels that it is not within the competence of the Special Committee to consider this question. We say that only as a matter of principle; this has nothing to do with political issues.

My delegation therefore expresses its reservation on paragraph 6 of document A/AC.109/L.1737, but that does not mean that it will oppose the required consensus.

Mr. MJAALAND (Norway): I wish to associate myself with the comments just made by the representative of Chile.

The Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands has been designated a strategic area. Under Article 83 of the United Nations Charter, all functions relating to such Territories shall be exercised by the Security Council, assisted by the Trusteeship Council. It is therefore not for the General Assembly or any of its subsidiary organs to consider this question.

My delegation therefore enters a formal reservation with regard to paragraph 6 of the draft report.

The CHAIRMAN: As there appear to be no further comments, may I take it that the Committee adopts the report and approves the conclusions and recommendations contained therein, it being understood that the reservations expressed by members will be reflected in the record of the meeting?

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has thus concluded its consideration of the item.

We shall next take up the report (A/AC.109/L.1738) relating to the United States Virgin Islands.

As there appear to be no comments, may I take it that the Committee adopts the report and approves the conclusions and recommendations contained therein?

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has thus concluded its consideration of the item.

That concludes the Committee's consideration of all the reports of the Sub-Committee on Small Territories, except the report on Guam.

I should like in this connection to place on record our most sincere appreciation to the Chairman of the Sub-Committee on Small Territories, Mr. Gahzi Jomaa of Tunisia, and the Rapporteur, Mr. Dag Mjaaland of Norway, for the active role they have played in bringing the Sub-Committee's work to a successful conclusion. I wish also to thank all the members of the Sub-Committee for their constructive contributions to its work.

In order to facilitate the submission in good time of the Committee's report to the General Assembly, I would suggest that, in keeping with the practice adopted by the Committee at previous sessions, the Rapporteur be requested to prepare and submit directly to the Assembly the various chapters of the report covering the items whose consideration has just been concluded by the Committee. If the Committee has no objection to following the time-honoured practice, that will be done.

Mr. BERGH JOHANSEN (Norway): Mr. Chairman, as you and the other members of the Committee are aware, my delegation has already started consultations with members of the Committee on an informal basis, and in the context of the Bureau, on

(Mr. Bergh Johansen, Norway)

a new draft resolution designed to streamline and rationalize the work of the Committee as well as that of the General Assembly. It is our intention to introduce the proposal and explain its background and implications at tomorrow's meeting.

I would therefore request that decisions so far made by the Committee on the reports from the Sub-Committee on Small Territories be viewed in the light of this fact, and that nothing that has occurred so far in our proceedings should bar the effective consideration of our proposal by the Committee.

Let me, finally, take this opportunity of assuring you, Mr. Chairman, of my delegation's full co-operation during this year's resumed session.

The CHAIRMAN: As the representative of Norway has suggested, he has certain proposals which have not been formally circulated to the members of the Committee. We are not all fully aware of their substance and content. It would thus be very hard to hold consultations and exchange views, let alone take a decision on that matter.

Perhaps, then, we will proceed to take a decision based on the traditional practice. The Committee is master of its own procedures and is at liberty, if it so wishes, to take up the proposal to be made tomorrow, deliberate on it and then decide. On the basis of that decision, we will determine subsequent actions.

If that is an agreeable position for the Committee to take concerning the proposals indicated by the representative of Norway, it will be so decided.

It was so decided.

Mr. JOMAA (Tunisia) (interpretation from French): First, on behalf of my delegation and on my own behalf, I wish to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your kind words addressed to me. As the representative of Tunisia, I was honored to succeed my colleague, Mr. Tekaya, in the chairmanship of the Sub-Committee on Small Territories, a task, difficult no doubt, but one greatly facilitated by the spirit of co-operation and understanding of all members of the Sub-Committee throughout our work.

Our session was quite difficult in terms of the time allocated to us for the consideration of the 13 Territories on our agenda. Indeed, our work was twice interrupted in order to enable some of us to participate in the seminars held in observance of the thirtieth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. In that connection, it was a pleasure for me to take part in the seminar on the Pacific held at Port Vila, Vanuatu, which was carried out in an atmosphere of understanding and cordiality.

(Mr. Jomaa, Tunisia)

It enabled us not only to conclude our work successfully but also, and in particular, to become more familiar with the very special problems of the Territories in the Pacific. The input from representatives of the administering Powers, non-governmental organizations and, above all, representatives of the Territories greatly helped us to formulate new and concrete conclusions and recommendations.

A large number of the Sub-Committee's meetings were held during the period between the two seminars. That is clearly reflected in the documents just introduced by our Rapporteur, which have been adopted by the Committee, with the exception of the one on Guam. We feel that the documents represent a very original approach to the problems faced by the Territories that remain non-self-governing and an attempt on our part to find appropriate solutions. The contribution of the Sub-Committee to the implementation of the Declaration in the Territories considered will, I hope, be taken into account by the administering Powers in fulfilling their responsibilities to the peoples under their administration.

I should also like to mention that our meetings generally benefited from the presence and co-operation of certain administering Powers, in particular the United States of America and New Zealand. I reiterate here, on behalf of the Sub-Committee, our appreciation to the representatives of those two countries for their participation in our work. However, the absence of the administering Power of the Territories of Anguilla, Bermuda, the British Virgin Islands, the Cayman Islands, Montserrat, Pitcairn, St. Helena and the Turks and Caicos Islands made it difficult to review those Territories. Unfortunately, a great number of questions of vital importance for those Territories raised by members of the Sub-Committee remain unanswered. I should like to take this opportunity to renew once again our appeal to the administering Power in question to reconsider its position and

(Mr. Jomaa, Tunisia)

restore the ties it has always had with our Committee and to do so in the interest of the aforementioned peoples.

I am certain that I now speak on behalf of all the members of the Sub-Committee in reiterating our request to the administering Powers to invite and facilitate visiting missions in their Territories. That would help us to obtain more direct and useful information in our formulation of concrete recommendations concerning those Territories.

The CHAIRMAN: Before adjourning, so as to facilitate our work and as indicated in aide-memoire 17/90 of 10 July 1990, I wish to remind those members wishing to take part in the debates relating to the questions of foreign economic interests, military activities and implementation of the Declaration by the specialized agencies, that the list of speakers in the general debates covering those items will be closed at 6 p.m. tomorrow.

As regards the question of Western Sahara, owing to current developments concerning the Territory, the Committee has been requested to consider that question towards the end of the session. If that is agreeable to all members, it will be so decided.

It was so decided.

Mr. SHAHEED (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): It is very surprising that there is no separate item on our agenda concerning other matters. It is the usual practice to have such an item on the agendas of all Committees. I should like to ask why that item is absent from our agenda.

The CHAIRMAN: I believe that this is a purely routine procedural matter which would have little consequence on the substance of our discussion. If he so wishes, however, the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic may at any time

(The Chairman)

raise any matter which he believes pertinent and relevant to the consideration of the Committee or its bodies, whether such an agenda item is indicated or not.

In any case, should that please the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, the Secretariat will handle that routine matter.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.